

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to the drawings:

The drawings are objected to as because they include the following reference characters not mentioned in the description: 80, 82, 84. Corrected drawing sheets or 5 amendment to the specification to add the reference characters are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Response:

Paragraph [0033] of the specification is amended above to describe each of the 10 reference characters 80, 82, and 84. In view of the amendments to the specification, acceptance of the drawings and the specification is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chiang 15 Shiung-Fei (US 4,895,376, hereinafter “Chiang”).

Response:

Independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to overcome these rejections. The claims now recite that when the interface apparatus is rotated in a plane parallel 20 with a plane of the display apparatus, the images displayed on the display panel move corresponding to the rotation of the interface apparatus. As shown at least in Figures 13-16 and described in the corresponding paragraphs [0028]-[0030] of the specification, when the interface apparatus 30 is rotated in a plane parallel with the plane of the display apparatus 24, the image displayed on the display panel 24 is 25 rotated as well to correspond to the movement of the interface apparatus 30.

On the other hand, Chiang does not teach that the disclosed interactive video

Appl. No. 10/710,665
Amdt. dated January 05, 2007
Reply to Office action of November 14, 2006

game can be rotated in a plane parallel with a plane of the display apparatus. Therefore, Chiang does not provide a way for the images displayed on the display screen to be rotated corresponding to this rotation. As such, Chiang does not teach all of the limitations recited in claims 1 and 5, and claims 1 and 5 should be allowable
5 over the cited prior art.

Furthermore, claims 2-4 and 6-8 are dependent on claims 1 and 5, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-8 is therefore respectfully requested.

10

In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

15 Sincerely yours,



Date: 01/05/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
20 Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.
25 is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)